

1 MICHAEL J. O'TOOLE (SBN 97779)  
2 City Attorney  
3 RANDOLPH S. HOM (SBN 152833)  
4 Assistant City Attorney  
5 CITY OF HAYWARD  
777 "B" Street  
Hayward, California 94541  
Telephone: (510) 583-4450  
Facsimile: (510) 583-3660

6 Attorneys for Defendants City of Hayward,  
Art Thoms, Scott Lunger, and Zachary Hoyer

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

KEVIN WALKER,  
10 Plaintiff,  
11 -vs-  
12 CITY OF HAYWARD, OFFICER ART  
13 THOMS, OFFICER SCOTT LUNGER, and  
14 OFFICER ZACHARY HOYER,  
15 individually and their official capacities;  
AMERICAN DISCOUNT SECURITY; and  
DAVID WARDAK aka DAVID WARDUK,  
16 Defendants.  
)  
Case No.: C 07 -06205 (TEH)  
}  
REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE;  
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND  
AUTHORITIES; (PROPOSED) ORDER  
[F.R.C.P. 12(b)(1), (6)]  
}  
Date: 2/11/08 (Monday)  
Time: 10:00 a.m.  
Crtrm:12  
450 Golden Gate Avenue, 19<sup>th</sup> Fl.  
San Francisco, California  
The Honorable Thelton E. Henderson

**TO PLAINTIFF AND HIS ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on February 11, 2008 at 10:00 a.m., in Courtroom 12,  
located of 450 Golden Gate Avenue, 19<sup>th</sup> Floor, San Francisco, California, defendants City of  
Hayward (“City”), Art Thoms (“Thoms”), Scott Lunger (“Lunger”), and Zachary Hoyer  
 (“Hoyer”) request that this Court take judicial notice of Exhibits B and C, attached to the  
Declaration of Randolph S. Hom, which are true and correct copies of plaintiffs’ claim presented  
to the City on December 4, 2007, and the City’s Notice of Rejection of Claim issued on  
December 20, 2007, and also referenced in defendants’ motion to dismiss which is filed  
concurrently with this request for judicial notice. This request is made pursuant to Federal Rules  
of Evidence Code Section 201, and the decision in Mullis v. United States Bank. Ct., 828 F.2d

1 1385, 1388 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1987). [Plaintiff alleged that “Plaintiff timely filed his notice of claim with  
2 the CITY OF HAYWARD asserting the state law causes of action against Defendants  
3 HAYWARD, THOMS, LUNGER, and HOYER” (Plaintiff’s complaint at 6:13-15.)  
4 Nevertheless, the Court need not accept as true the allegations that conduct facts which may be  
5 judicially noticed by the Court.]

The request for judicial notice will be based upon this Notice, the Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the Declaration of Randolph S. Hom, the pleadings and records contained in the court file, the Motion to Dismiss filed and served concurrently with this notice, and with any other oral and documentary evidence presented to the Court at the time of hearing.

## **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

**I. THE COURT MAY JUDICIALLY NOTICE OFFICIAL GOVERNMENT RECORDS WHICH ARE CAPABLE OF READY AND ACCURATE DETERMINATION AND WHICH CONTRADICT FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS ON THE FACE OF THE PLEADINGS**

Federal Rules of Evidence Section 201(b)(2) allows the court to judicially notice facts “capable of accurate and ready determination by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned.” On a motion to dismiss, the court may take judicial notice of matters of public record outside the pleadings. MGIC Indemnity Corp. v. Weisman, 803 F.2d 500, 504 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1986). Pursuant to Federal Rules of Evidence Section 201, a court may take judicial notice of a city’s official records. Grassroots v. County of San Francisco, 1994 U.S.Dist LEXIS 15130 (N.D. CA 1994); see also Poway Unified School District v. Superior Court, 62 Cal.App.4th 1496 (1998). It should be noted that the court need not accept as true the allegations that contradict facts which may be judicially noticed by the court. Mullis v. United States Bank Ct., 828 F.2d 1385, 1388 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1987).

Accordingly, all documents maintained by the City relating to plaintiff's claim, including his claim presented to the City on December 4, 2007, and the City's Notice of Rejection of Claim issued on December 20, 2007 are within the scope of Federal Rules of Evidence Section 201. Moreover, the content of the factual allegations in said documents including the date of presentation of the claim, and the issuance date of the City's Notice of

1 Rejection of Claim are not reasonably subject to dispute. Federal Rules of Evidence Section 201.

2 **II. CONCLUSION**

3 Based on the foregoing, defendants respectfully requests that this court take judicial  
4 notice of the aforementioned exhibits.

5

6 DATED: January 2, 2008

MICHAEL J. O'TOOLE, City Attorney

7

8

By: /S/

RANDOLPH S. HOM, Assistant City Attorney,  
Attorneys for Defendants City of Hayward, Art  
Thoms, Scott Lunger, and Zachary Hoyer

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28